

**REMARKS**

**I.     Introduction**

With the addition of new claims 14 to 18, claims 7 to 18 are now pending, since claims 1 to 6 were previously canceled. It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgement of the claim to foreign priority and the indication that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that the drawings filed June 23, 2005 have been accepted.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statements, PTO-1449 papers, and cited references. With respect to the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed June 23, 2005, which were apparently not provided by the International Search Authority, Applicants submit herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and PTO-1449 paper, which includes copies of the previously disclosed references. However, the copies are courtesy copies. Accordingly, no fees are believed to be due.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 8 to 12 include allowable subject matter.

**II.    Rejection of Claim 8 to 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 8 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as assertedly indefinite. While Applicants do not agree with the merits of this rejection, to facilitate matters, claims 8 and 9 have been amended to obviate the present rejection. Approval and entry of the amendments, and withdrawal of the present rejection, is therefore respectfully requested.

**III. Rejection of Claims 7 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,439,038 ("Rosel").

Claim 7 relates to a method for diagnosing a dynamic characteristics of a lambda sensor, and provides for detecting at least one actuating variable of the lambda control and comparing the at least one actuating variable to a specifiable maximum threshold. Rosel on the other hand refer to ascertaining switching times of a jump lambda sensor during the transition from a firing operation to a deceleration fuel cutoff or vice versa. The switching times are not actuating variables of a lambda control.

Thus, Rosel does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 7, so that Rosel does not anticipate claim 7.

Claim 13 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 7, so that Rosel does not anticipate claim 13 for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 7.

Withdrawal of the present rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

**IV. New Claims 14 to 18**

Claims 14 to 17 have been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 14 to 18 do not add any new matter and are fully supported by the present application, including the specification. Each of claims 14 to 18 depends from claim 13 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reason as claim 13.

**VII. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of presently pending claims 8 to 17 are allowable. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: February 13, 2008

By:  / (Reg. No. 59,210) for:

Gerard A. Messina  
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200

**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**